

1 **Sanjay S. Schmidt (SBN 247475)**
2 **LAW OFFICE OF SANJAY S. SCHMIDT**
3 1388 Sutter Street, Suite 810
4 San Francisco, CA 94109
5 Tel. (415) 563-8583
6 Fax. (415) 223-9717
7 e-mail: ss@sanjayschmidtlaw.com_

8 **TAI C. BOGAN (SBN 241784)**
9 **THE BOGAN LAW FIRM, APC**
10 615 13th Street, Suite A
11 Modesto, CA 95354
12 Tel. (209) 566-9591 x 101
13 Fax. (209) 566-9668
14 e-mail: tai.bogan@theboganlawfirm.com

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff,*
16 **BRANDON GRAY**

17 **PATRICK D. MORIARTY**, State Bar No. 213185
18 pmoriarty@aghlaw.com
19 **JOHN B. ROBINSON**, State Bar No. 297065
20 jrobinson@aghlaw.com
21 **ALLEN, GLAESSNER, HAZELWOOD & WERTH, LLP**
22 180 Montgomery Street, Suite 1200
23 San Francisco, CA 94104
24 Tel.: (415) 697-2000
25 Fax: (415) 813-2045

26 *Attorneys for Defendant*
27 **CITY OF MODESTO**

28 **Bruce D. Praet (SBN 119430)**
29 **FERGUSON, PRAET & SHERMAN**
30 A Professional Corporation
31 1631 East 18th Street,
32 Santa Ana, CA 92705
33 Tel. (714) 953-5300
34 Fax. (714) 953-1143
35 e-mail: Bpraet@aol.com

36 *Attorneys for Defendant*
37 **CITY OF OAKDALE**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
FRESNO COURTHOUSE

BRANDON GRAY,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF OAKDALE, a municipal corporation; City of Oakdale Police Department Officers **DOES 1-10**, individually; **CITY OF MODESTO**, a municipal corporation; City of Modesto Police Department Officers **DOES 11-20**, individually; **COUNTY OF STANISLAUS**, a public entity; Stanislaus County Sheriff's Department Deputies **DOES 21-30**, individually; California Highway Patrol Officers **DOES 31-40**, individually; and **DOES 41-100**, Jointly and Severally,

Defendants,

Case No.: 1:21-cv-01086-JLT-BAM

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER TO CONTINUE SCHEDULING
CONFERENCE**

Plaintiff, BRANDON GRAY ("Plaintiff"), by and through his counsel of record, Defendant CITY OF MODESTO ("CITY"), by and through its counsel of record, Defendant CITY OF OAKDALE, by and through its counsel of record, and Defendant COUNTY OF STANISLAUS, by and through its counsel of record, hereby respectfully stipulate to continuing the initial mandatory scheduling conference for approximately three months, from February 24, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., until May 24, 2022, if that is acceptable and convenient for the Court.

Good cause exists for continuing the initial mandatory scheduling conference because counsel for Plaintiff, the City of Oakdale, and the City of Modesto are now in the process of exchanging documents and are actively engaged in early settlement discussions. Additionally, Plaintiff anticipates dismissing the County of Stanislaus shortly, having now received some documents, and in view of the expectation that more will be received soon; this dismissal will

render the County of Stanislaus's pending motion to dismiss, ECF Nos. 28, 28-1, moot. Continuing the settlement conference while the parties attempt to resolve the matter early, in good faith, will allow counsel for the parties to conserve the time involved in preparing a joint scheduling report, as well as attending the conference, and will allow the Court to conserve the time expended in holding the scheduling conference, and issuing a scheduling report.

The passage of time will not result in prejudice because the parties have learned there is drone footage that captured the incident, which could also help facilitate settlement discussions, there potentially is body worn camera footage, and there is a cellular phone video taken by a bystander.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 17, 2022

ALLEN, GLAESSNER,
HAZELWOOD & WERTH, LLP

By: /s/Patrick D. Moriarty*
PATRICK D. MORIARTY
JOHN B. ROBINSON
Attorneys for Defendant
CITY OF MODESTO

Dated: February 17, 2022

THE LAW OFFICE OF SANJAY S. SCHMIDT

By: /s/ Sanjay S. Schmidt
SANJAY S. SCHMIDT
Attorneys for Plaintiff
BRANDON GRAY

Dated: February 17, 2022

FERGUSON, PRAET & SHERMAN

By: /s/ Bruce D. Praet*
BRUCE D. PRAET
Attorneys for CITY OF OAKDALE
Defendants

//
//

1 Dated: February 17, 2022

PORTER SCOTT
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

4 By: /s/ John R. Whitefleet*
Attorneys for Defendant COUNTY OF
STANISLAUS

8 *Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Praet, and Mr. Whitefleet gave their consent to file this document via
9 CM-ECF.

10 **ORDER**

11 The Court, having reviewed the parties' stipulation and request, and good cause
12 appearing, finds and orders as follows:

13 The Scheduling Conference is HEREBY CONTINUED to **May 31, 2022, at 8:30 AM in**
14 **Courtroom 8 (BAM) before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe**. The parties shall file a
15 Joint Scheduling Report one week prior to the conference. The parties shall appear at the
16 conference remotely with each party connecting either via Zoom video conference or Zoom
17 telephone number. The parties will be provided with the Zoom ID and password by the
18 Courtroom Deputy prior to the conference. The Zoom ID and password are confidential and are
19 not to be shared. Appropriate court attire required.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: **February 17, 2022**

/s/ *Barbara A. McAuliffe*
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE